

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-14 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 4 are independent. In light of the remarks contained herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 4, 5-7, and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ueda et al.* (USP 5,748,237) in view of *Hibino et al.* (USP 5,751,343) and *Hattori et al.* (USP 5,739,859); rejects claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ueda et al.* in view of *Hibino et al.* and *Hattori et al.* and further in view of *Etoh* (USP 5,729,289); and rejects claims 8-9 and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ueda et al.* in view of *Hibino et al.* and *Hattori et al.* and further in view of *Kawada et al.* (USP 5,179,437) or *Konishi et al.* (USP 5,461,429).

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) -  
*Ueda et al./Hibino et al./Hattori et al.***

In support of the Examiner's rejection of claim 1, the Examiner asserts that *Ueda et al.* discloses a signal correction circuit, citing to reference numerals 24-27. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of this reference.

The disclosure of *Ueda et al.* is directed to a backlighting and color control arrangement for an LCD-type video camera

viewfinder having multiple backlighting sources. The viewfinder as depicted in Fig. 1 includes a viewfinder barrel 1, a liquid crystal plate or LCD 2 and eyepiece 3 disposed in front of a front surface of LCD 2 on an eyepiece portion 4 side. A backlight 5 for applying light to a rear surface of the LCD 2 is disposed at a certain distance or interval behind the LCD 2 (col. 2, lines 52-60). Specifically, at col. 4, lines 6-14, *Ueda et al.* recites as follows:

The external light and the light applied from the back light 5 differ in colour temperature (wavelength) from each other. Therefore, when the external light and the light applied from the back light 5 are used simultaneously the difference between color temperatures of the external light and the light applied from the back light 5 can be corrected to some degree by providing the color conversion filter 7 in the external light admitting window 6 in order to make color of the image displayed on the LCD 2 approximate to that of natural light.

In contrast, the present invention as set forth in claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a liquid crystal display device including a signal correction circuit for subjecting the applied image signal to a correction for outdoor display in response to a setting by the setting unit for admission of the outside light. While *Ueda et al.* provides for correction due to the fact that external light and light emitted from the backlight 5 differ in color temperature, there is no teaching or suggestion of a signal correction circuit for subjecting the applied image signal to a correction for outdoor

display. Thus, *Ueda et al.* fails to teach a signal correction circuit for subjecting the applied image signal to a correction for outdoor display in response to a setting by the setting unit for admission of the outside light. As such, it is respectfully submitted that *Ueda et al.* fails to disclose subjecting the applied image signal to a correction for outdoor display.

It is further submitted that both *Hibino et al.* and *Hattori et al.* fail to cure the deficiencies of the teachings of *Ueda et al.* as neither of these references teach a signal correction circuit for subjecting the applied image signal to a correction for outdoor display, assuming these references are combinable, which Applicant does not admit. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not obvious, and thus allowable over, *Ueda et al.* in view of *Hibino et al.* and *Hattori et al.*

Further, the disclosure of *Ueda et al.* solves a different problem from the problem solved with the present invention. *Ueda et al.* is directed to back lighting and color control arrangement for an LCD-type video camera viewfinder having multiple back lighting sources. The disclosure presents the problem of utilizing a video camera with the back light disposed behind a liquid crystal panel of the color liquid crystal display apparatus. *Ueda et al.* notes that an arrangement of this particular type has a problem when the cameraman uses a video camera outdoors under strong light, since an

amount of light from the back light is extremely small as compared with that of the sun light. In this situation, the cameraman perceives the image displayed on the surface of the liquid crystal panel as being extremely dark (col. 1, lines 17-27).

Ueda et al. seeks to solve this problem by providing for a viewfinder arrangement for a video camera where an eyepiece is positioned on an end of a viewfinder barrel where the eyepiece is disposed in front of a front surface of a liquid crystal display panel (col. 2, lines 52-58). The viewfinder barrel has an external light admitting window 6 formed through its upper portion above a portion between the liquid crystal display panel 2 and the back light 5 (col. 2, lines 61-63). When both the external light and the light applied from the back light 5 differ, the color is corrected in order to obtain a color approximate to the natural color under any shooting condition (col. 4, lines 15-21). Thus, the front of the LCD panel is not exposed to direct light externally from the case.

In contrast, the present invention set forth in claim 1 provides for a liquid crystal display device including a signal correction circuit for subjecting the applied image signal to a correction for outdoor display in response to a setting by the setting unit for admission of the outside light wherein a signal correction circuit subjects the applied image signal to at least

one correction selected from a group consisting of gamma correction, luminance correction, contour correction, hue correction, and color saturation correction. Thus, if the camera is used outdoors, the image displayed on the liquid crystal display panel can be easy to see based upon the multiple back light sources.

While Ueda et al. provides for multiple back lighting sources, this does not affect the user's ability to see the LCD display panel of Ueda et al. as the disclosure of Ueda et al. provides for a viewfinder barrel with an eyepiece 3. Thus, regardless of whether the user is indoors or outdoors, the image appearing on the LCD panel does not need to be corrected due to external light affecting the image.

Finally, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's statement that the Applicant's failure to assert arguments against the Examiner's claim that the references teach an outdoor display constitutes an admission of the teachings of this feature by the prior art. There is no requirement that the Applicant provide arguments against all of the Examiner's assertions in an Official Action. Applicant assumes that the Examiner is confusing his argument with the requirement that the Applicant must respond to all instances of the Examiner's taking of Official Notice in an Official Action. As recited in § 2144.04, if the Applicant does not

traverse the Examiner's assertion of Official Notice then the Examiner's assertion that a particular feature is common knowledge or well known in the art is taken to be admitted prior art based upon Applicant's failure to traverse the examiner's assertion of Official Notice. However, as the Examiner has relied upon the teachings of the combination of *Ueda et al.*, *Hibino et al.*, and *Hattori et al.*, and has not asserted any Official Notice, the Applicant is not precluded from challenging any portion of the Examiner's rejection at any time. Should the Examiner maintain his assertion, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner provide legal authority.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 4 contains elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1 and, thus, claim 4, together with claims dependent thereon, are allowable over *Ueda et al.* in view of *Hibino et al.* and *Hattori et al.*

#### **Request for Interview**

A request for interview is being filed concurrently with this Reply. Prior to the Examiner's consideration of this Reply, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to conduct an interview and discuss the outstanding rejections.

#### **Conclusion**

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully

Appl. No. 09/695,917

requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet (Reg. No. 52,327) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Applicant respectfully petitions for a two (2) month extension of time pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a). A check in the amount of \$420.00 in payment of the extension of time fee is attached.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

Marc S. Weiner, #32,181

MSW/CMV/jdm  
0905-0248P

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000